

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated March 25, 2010, in which the Examiner objected to the Abstract and rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants claim for priority. However, Applicants respectfully point out that box 12(a)(3) should be indicated on PTOL-326 rather than box 12(a)(1). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide a corrected PTOL-326 in the next Office Action.

Attached to this Amendment is a Replacement Sheet for FIG. 2 in order to correct a typographical error. Support for the amendment can be found in paragraph [0047] of the published application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner approves the correction.

Attached to this amendment is a corrected Abstract. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner approves the correction and withdraws the objection to the Abstract.

As indicated above, claims 1, 19, and 36 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement to patentability. Claim 14 has been amended to correct dependency. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and does not narrow the literal scope of the claim.

Claim 1 claims a dialog control device, claim 19 claims a dialog control method, and claim 36 claims a robot. The device, method, and robot customize dialog between a user and the robot. A memory means stores various pieces of information appendant to an object such as values corresponding to respective items of the object. The various pieces of information are acquired by the robot by one of a voice recognition process and visual recognition of a user. A conversation generating means selects, in response to an item of an object defined as a topic about the user, another topic about the user relating to the topic used in the immediately

preceding conversation. The conversation generating means generates (1) an acquisition conversation for acquiring the value of the items selected as the topic, or (2) a utilization conversation for utilizing the value of the item in the topic already stored in the memory means as the next conversation. The conversation generating means is adapted to store the acquired value, acquired by the acquisition conversation, as the value of the corresponding item. The dialog control device or robot makes a conversation with the user that is customized for the user.

By (a) storing various pieces of information acquired by either voice recognition process or visual recognition of a user, (b) selecting another topic about the user in response to a topic about the user used in an immediately preceding conversation, and (c) generating either an acquisition conversation or a utilization conversation as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36, the claimed invention provides a dialog control device, method, and robot which has a conversation with a user that is customized for the user. The prior art does not show, teach, or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 19, and 36.

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Fukui, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,918,222).

Fukui, et al. appears to disclose an information disclosing apparatus for disclosing data owned by individuals to third parties (Col. 1, lines 7-9). FIG. 1 discloses an information disclosing apparatus 1 as connected to a demander terminal 4 through a communication means such as a network. The information disclosing apparatus performs an interactive operation for information disclosure on the basis of a message sent from the demander terminal 4, retrieves information owned by an information provider and stored in a data storage unit 2, and discloses the retrieved information to the demander terminal 4 but rejects the information disclosure, as needed (Col. 20, lines 5-17). The fourth embodiment discloses a case in which the current status

of a demander interacting with the information disclosing apparatus 1 is understood, and this is reflected in a response (Col. 20, lines 45-50). A person who discloses and provides information is called an information provider, and a person who accesses an information disclosing apparatus to obtain information is called a user. The information disclosing apparatus is called an agent. The direct negotiation between a user and the information provider without going through the agent is called direct line connection (Col. 45, lines 61-67). When a user inputs a text command stream, the user can access an agent (Col. 46, lines 4-7). The agent retrieves user information such as the right of access and degree of familiarity for a topic is traced on an information provider model access to form a territory serving as a disclosure enable range for a specific user, thereby forming a personal relationship model. When the information provider and the user are more intimate, the number of shared topics is large and the degree of detail increases. Pieces of the disclosure information are classified into information derived from individual information, information derived from an organizational business operation and highly public information (Col. 46, lines 30-60). A response plan formation plan shows emotion check plan formation where the emotion check indicates the check of the user's reaction upon a change in topic (Col. 52, lines 16-25).

Thus, *Fukui, et al.* merely discloses an agent disclosing information owned by an information provider to a user. Nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches, or suggests customizing dialog between a user and a robot based on a topic about the user as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36. Rather, *Fukui, et al.* merely discloses an agent providing information to a user.

Furthermore, *Fukui, et al.* merely discloses an information provider storing information in a data storage unit which the agent retrieves. Thus, nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests selecting a topic about a user which is related to a topic about the user used in an

immediately preceding conversation as claimed in claims 1, 19, and 36. Rather, *Fukui, et al.* only discloses an information provider storing information in a data storage device which is retrieved by an agent.

Furthermore, *Fukui, et al.* only discloses that the agent retrieves user information based upon the user demand. Nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests generating (1) an acquisition conversation for acquiring an item selected as a topic about the user, or (2) a utilization conversation for utilizing the items as the next conversation as claimed in claims 1, 19, and 36. Rather, *Fukui, et al.* only discloses retrieving user information based upon a user's demand.

Finally, *Fukui, et al.* merely discloses that an information provider provides the information to the agent via the data storage unit. Nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches, or suggests that the various pieces of the information are acquired by the robot by voice recognition or visual recognition of a user as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36. Rather, *Fukui, et al.* only discloses that the information provider provides the information to the agent.

Applicants respectfully point out that *Fukui, et al.* is directed to presenting information to a user which the user inquired about and in particular, in the fourth embodiment, determining the intent and emotion of the user in order to tailor the response to the user's emotional state. However, the claimed invention is directed to a robot having a customized conversation with the user about the user.

Since nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches, or suggests (a) customizing a dialog for a user by selecting a topic about the user related to a topic about the user used in an immediately preceding conversation, (b) generating either an acquisition conversation for acquiring information about the topic, or a utilizing conversation for utilizing the information in a next

conversation, and (c) storing information acquired by voice recognition or visual recognition as claimed in claims 1, 19, and 36, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 19, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2-18 and 20-35 depend from claims 1 and 19 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-18 and 20-35 would not have been anticipated by *Fukui, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-18 and 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530

Date: May 19, 2010